



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

from the United States through Europe and in arriving again in his own country without irreparable injury to his immortal spirit, his status in the world hereafter need cause him little concern. *Sic eunt fata hominum*—just as if our souls were in need of more world circumstance to give them bent.

MAN'S FAITH IN HIS GOD

FAITH in a living God, sometimes in living gods, has been a prevailing characteristic of most human beings, at least since the beginnings of recorded history. When Aristotle taught that "God extends from eternity to eternity," he was expressing a faith that had persisted throughout the centuries before. When Napoleon remarked that "all things proclaim the existence of God," he echoed something out of an utterance of that other and more ancient asseveration by Hannibal, that "it is impossible to do anything against the will of God."

And yet this faith has never endured unchallenged. Controversy has met it at every turn throughout the ages. Perhaps the divergency of views has never been more clearly stated than by Voltaire, of whom the Right Honorable John Morley wrote in 1872: "Voltaire's work from first to last was alert with unquenchable fire." Among the "Miscellaneous Papers" of this Parisian wit, poet, and historian, arch foe of intolerance and fanaticism, he has some remarks "On the Existence of God." Aiming, as he says, to divest himself of all passion and prejudice, he sets forth to treat the theme in the spirit of reason. He begins by pointing out that there are peoples who have no knowledge of a creator. He goes on to point out that children have no native conception of God, and that among adults the ideas of God are far from uniform. Granting that there seems to be an order and a purpose in the universe, this justifies us in concluding simply that "it is probable that an intelligent and superior being has skillfully prepared and fashioned the matter." In other words, it all "simply means that there is something more powerful than I, and beyond this, nothing."

He then goes on to give a synopsis of the metaphysical argument for the existence of a God, an argument familiar in his day, a thesis which he grants "leads to much vaster conceptions." This metaphysical argument he finds rests upon the fact of existence. If something exists, it exists either of itself or it has received its being from another. In either event, there must have been a creator, hence a God, a being which has existed necessarily through himself from eternity and who has originated all other beings, himself infinite in duration, immensity, and power. But he proceeds to summarize the objections which can be raised to any

argument for the existence of a God, such as the incredibility of a system created out of nothing, of a being infinitely wise existing through an eternity preceding creation without making the least use of his power, of a God infinitely good creating life so filled with manifest infinite miseries.

Just now the controversy has been brought afresh to our attention by twenty-one Chinese students now in this country, students who are asking certain questions about America's faith in God. The questions have been addressed to a thousand Americans of different professional and occupational classes. The questions were: (1) What is your idea of God? (2) Do you believe in God? (3) Why?

President W. H. P. Faunce, of Brown University, one of the eminent men questioned, with his characteristic lucidity of expression, answered in a way that, we believe, voices substantially the best thought of the majority of men. He said:

"1. My idea of God is an idea and not an image. He cannot be painted or carved, since God is spirit and not body. He is like our human spirits—invisible to eyes of flesh, but conscious and personal. God must be like the highest we know, which is personality. If He is not like wood or stone, so He is not like blind, unconscious energy. He is like the purest spirits we have ever known, 'like as a Father,' like the saints and heroes of history, only infinitely beyond and above them. They are fragments of personality; He is the one fully realized Person. His infinite spirit, pervading all time and space, sleeps in matter, wakes in mind, and reveals itself supremely in Jesus of Nazareth.

"2. In such a God I believe, because without Him nothing can be explained. Unless behind the stars there is intelligence, it is useless for intelligent men to study them. But the deeper we go into nature, the more clearly we perceive intelligence, adaptation, wisdom. And the more deeply we study the souls of men or our own souls, the more clearly we perceive the image and superscription of God. To live deeply is to have experience of God.

"3. I believe in such a God because otherwise I could not believe in anything, but should be an absolute skeptic. If I did not believe in God I could not believe in any permanent laws of nature or any abiding virtue in men. It is either God or chance and chaos; either a spirit at the heart of the universe or no spirit anywhere, no duty, no truth, no law, no life. Since God explains all things, He Himself cannot be explained. He can only be worshiped, trusted, used each day by His children."

THERE IS LEAVEN in the loaf. "Plans for a world federation of engineers, designed primarily to work for international peace," were the words which headed the announcement of the dinner arranged by the Federated American Engineering Societies, under

date of October 10. Why not? The politicians have always broken down in the job of establishing international peace. Why not give the engineers a chance?

THE RECENT ARTICLE in the *Atlantic Monthly* by Mr. Frank I. Cobb, editor of the *New York World*, on the "Economic Aspects of Disarmament," has attracted the widespread attention that Mr. Cobb's able and careful treatment of the subject merited. Men must think, when confronted with such statements as Mr. Cobb's, that after destroying in the World War \$348,000,000,000 in wealth and production, we now annually set aside the income of \$160,000,000,000 to pay the costs of past and future wars. Men must think, too, when confronted by the statement, as true as it is startling, that if there is "a war during the lifetime of the next generation, on a scale equal to that of the recent war, it makes no difference who triumphs or who is defeated, victor and vanquished alike will perish in the ruins of the civilization that they have destroyed."

"SUSPENDRE les journaux pangermanistes pendant trois semaines est une bonne mesure," which, being interpreted, means, "To suspend the Pan German newspapers for three weeks would be a fine thing," and "*Mais suspendre les pangermanistes eux-mêmes pendant trois minutes serait plus efficace*," which, also being interpreted, means, "But to suspend the Pan Germans themselves for a little matter of three minutes would be more effective," are the sentiments which appeared as feature lines at the head of the third edition of *Le Journal*, Paris, September 3, in the year of grace 1921. Thus it is that the candle of love and sweet reasonableness throws its beams in a haughty world.

FEARS of Germany are not confined to France. London papers are still finding "big Berthas" in trees, gas in running brooks, soldiers in stones, and bad in everything. Under date of September 30, the *London Times* finds it necessary again to warn the country that Germany has a secret army of something like 800,000 men, and that she is attempting to make provision in respect of army clothing, depots, and material for an army of just that size. It demands that the Military Commission of Control must be continued, with its "right of search," to inspect units, to call for documents, to visit the German War Office, and to overhaul the estimates. "Such control is for Europe, and for France in particular, the chiefest form of guarantee that could be devised." In the long line of surreptitious military activities in Germany there are the military societies affiliated with the notorious Pan German "Orgesch."

There is a danger that the German militarist clique will evade the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. We must not close our eyes to dangerous realities. There must be no hypertrophy of German militarism. So runs the scare lines. We, too, are of the opinion that these things should be watched in Germany. We beg leave to add that we are also of the opinion that all of the nations may well hunt out these things within themselves, condemn them, and abolish them, collectively of course, with all the moral power at their command. For the war spirit is the war spirit, wherever found, be it in Dan or Beersheba.

DR. A. FRANK PHILIPSON, a noted chemist, will probably claim the credit for having originated the liquid death, a poison recently perfected by the Chemical Warfare Division of the Army." These are the words quoted from a press dispatch under date of September 22. We refer to this statement because it is difficult to imagine why one should wish to "claim the credit." So powerful is the poison, we are told, that three drops touching any portion of the body will mean instant death, and if spread from airplanes it would kill all living things and burn all inflammable material it touches. The dispatch goes on to say, "Already the government has equipped 200 airplanes to spread the poison, and something over 2,000 tons of it have been manufactured."

This chemical warfare business is foreboding enough. Sir T. Edward Thorpe, in his presidential address to the British Association at Edinburgh, said that between April, 1915, and September, 1918, the Germans had at least eighteen different forms of poisons—gases, liquids, and solids—for use in the war. The knowledge of this fact led to reprisals, with the result, as Sir William Pope tells us, that at the time of the armistice the Allies had enough mustard gas to envelop the Germans knee deep, and that they also had a vapor, proof against any respirator, that would "stop a man," if projected into the atmosphere in the proportion of one to five millions. Sir William went on to add that in his judgment such gases are more merciful than high explosives, and that the wars of the future will be chemical wars.

We do not care to go into the question whether or not it is pleasanter to be killed with a poison gas or an exploding bomb, but we have difficulty in following the mental processes of the distinguished scientist who would "claim the credit" for inventing some such new and more effective method of destroying human life. The biographer of Joseph Ignace Guillotin goes to some pains to point out that while this French physician, while attached to the Constituent Assembly in 1789, did propose that all capital punishment should be by

decapitation, a privilege till then reserved for the nobility, and did suggest that decapitation could be most quickly and humanely performed by a machine, he was not the "inventor of the guillotine." The real inventor of that swift instrument, a man named Schmidt, has been lost to history.

LIMITATIONS ON THE FUNCTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL COURTS

By HERBERT A. SMITH, of McGill University

AT THE Editor's invitation, I am writing a few notes by way of criticism of Dr. Borchard's article on this subject in the July number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. I had the privilege of hearing Dr. Borchard speak on this subject at Philadelphia last May, and I would wish to preface my remarks by saying that I entirely agree with him in deprecating the ill-informed enthusiasm which expects to see the Golden Age inaugurated by the mere establishment of a permanent international court. In some remarks which I made myself at the Philadelphia meeting I tried to point out that certain highly important conditions remained to be fulfilled before the court could even be given an obligatory jurisdiction, the most essential of these preliminary conditions being the enactment by consent of a detailed and comprehensive code of international law. In criticizing Dr. Borchard's article, therefore, I wish to do so from the standpoint of one who thoroughly appreciates the difficulties that still lie in our path. What I say must be very brief.

Dr. Borchard tells us that "the existing order of international life—at least, among the larger powers—is conditioned upon a continual struggle for economic advantage." This appears to me to be one of those sweeping generalizations in which the mistake is made of treating the part as if it were the whole. Economic competition undoubtedly forms a very large element—too large an element—in international as it does in individual life. But it is not everything. In the world of today there is already a very considerable amount of international organization, the whole purpose of which is to eliminate unnecessary competition and possible occasions of conflict.

Take, for example, such an institution as the Postal Union. The sole aim of this organization is to provide an international postal service the smooth working of which shall be unhampered by economic competition or by the conflicting interests of different nations. Many other examples will readily occur to the reader, such as the establishment of uniform rules for navigation and the international protection of copyright under the Berne Convention.

An illustration which is even more closely relevant to the present discussion is afforded by the International Joint Commission, which sits permanently to adjudicate upon questions that may arise between the United States and Canada. The working of the Commission has been admirably set forth by Mr. Wyvell in the June number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and I will not presume to trespass upon his ground. But I would venture to ask

how the establishment and harmonious operation of this Commission can possibly be explained in accordance with the doctrine that "the existing order of international life . . . is conditioned upon a continual struggle for economic advantage." Most men, I think, will find here a very clear case in which the principle of co-operation and judicial settlement has been successfully substituted for that of selfish competition.

The permanent international court is no new thing, no unprecedented inversion of the natural order of human society. It is merely one stage further along a well-marked road, one more step in the development of an international organization which in other matters has already been functioning successfully for several generations. The earlier developments have succeeded only because men have resolved to make them succeed. Upon the same condition depends the success of the working of the new court.

I notice that Dr. Borchard does not think that at present there is any real desire for the establishment of an international tribunal. As to this, each man must form his own opinion. So far as I have been able to study opinion in Canada and Great Britain, I would say unhesitatingly that it is overwhelmingly in favor of the principle of judicial settlement, and I would like to think that the same is true of the United States.

Dr. Borchard quite rightly points out that many occasions of international disagreement present no question of international law. The same, of course, is true of the bulk of commercial competition in ordinary life. No court, whether municipal or international, can interfere in any dispute unless some question of legal right is involved. Commercial firms may compete with one another in a hundred ways that are well within the limits of the law, and so long as they do not transgress those limits the courts have no jurisdiction to intervene. Similarly, the international court will have no jurisdiction in a case where the commercial policy of Utopia, though very injurious to Arcadia, involves no breach of treaty obligations or any other violation of established international rights. It is equally clear that in such a case Arcadia will have no right to resort to war any more than the proprietor of a store is justified in setting fire to the store of his successful competitor across the street. In neither case is it within the wit of man to devise any machinery of justice which will absolutely prevent the possibility of violence. But the mere possibility—or even likelihood—that in certain cases a party may resort to violence rather than to justice is no reason why we should refuse to set up a tribunal for the determination and adjustment of rights according to law. The reasons for preferring a permanent court rather than occasional boards of arbitration are by now familiar to all students of the question and I shall not repeat them here.

Experience has already shown that the establishment of a permanent tribunal, such as the American Supreme Court or the International Joint Commission, tends to create what we may call a habit of reference. This in its turn develops a public opinion which regards judicial process as the normal and regular method of settling a question in dispute. I cannot too often repeat that it is upon the growth of a sound public opinion that we must rely if the principle of judicial settlement is to be accepted as part of the normal order of the world. With-